

**Core Question 3: Is the organization effective and well run?**

The Governance and Leadership Performance Framework, outlined in Core Question 3, gauges the academic and operational leadership of schools. Core Question 3 consists of six indicators designed to measure schools on how well their school administration and board of directors comply with the terms of their charter agreement, applicable laws, and authorizer expectations.


3.1. Is the school leader strong in his or her academic and organizational leadership?							
Indicator Targets	Does not meet standard	The school leader presents concerns in a majority of the sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.					
	Approaching standard	The school leader presents concerns in a minimal number of the sub-indicators and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.					
	Meets standard	The school leader complies with and presents no concerns in the sub-indicators below.					
	Exceeds standard	The school leader consistently and effectively complies with and presents no concerns in the sub-indicators below.					
3.1 Rating	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	<b>2015-16</b>	2016-17
	MS	MS	MS	MS	MS	MS	
Sub-indicator Ratings	Sub-indicators						Rating
	Demonstration of sufficient academic and leadership experience						ES
	Leadership stability in key administrative positions						AS
	Communication with internal and external stakeholders						ES
	Clarity of roles among schools and staff						MS
	Engagement in a continuous process of improvement and establishment of systems for addressing areas of deficiency in a timely manner						ES
	Consistency in providing information to and consulting with the schools' board of directors						MS

The Excel Center is a part of a network of eleven Excel Centers across the state of Indiana. The network has developed a robust leadership team to effectively manage school operations. The three Regional Directors, all with backgrounds in school leadership, worked closely with the school directors in data analysis, problem solving, and professional development. Each building's school director managed the day-to-day operations of the school and implemented network-wide initiatives. School directors have several years of teaching and school leadership experience, advanced degrees in education, and many began as teachers within the

network. The Excel Center schools also have access to the Goodwill Education Initiatives (GEI) staff, which provided additional supports in the areas of finances, operations, data, and curriculum and instruction.

In April of 2016, the COO of GEI stepped down from his position, resulting in some internal transitions and turnover for the Excel Center network. While this caused some temporary instability in leadership, GEI quickly identified someone with a significant amount of network experience to take on many of those responsibilities and to continue setting the vision and oversight for the network. Aside from the transition at the executive leadership level, roles and responsibilities of the regional director and school director were clearly delineated. Further, the Excel Center employs a version of the RISE Evaluation System, which outlines clear roles and responsibilities for teachers and leaders.

### Organizational Chart



Internally, school directors maintained frequent communication with staff and participated in regular meetings with regional directors and other School Directors. The Regional Directors were responsible for the majority of communications with external stakeholders, including the board of directors, Board Chair, Mayor's Office (OEI), GEI, and community partners. Together, they have developed meaningful community partnerships (particularly through local businesses and universities) to directly provide services and supports to the schools and students. Information was consistently accurate, relevant, and timely, and allowed the board to react appropriately to school performance.


The COO of GEI, Regional Directors and School Directors consistently reflected on several areas of school data to inform day-to-day decisions. Leaders at all levels routinely considered the challenges that their students faced and how they could best support their efforts to receive a meaningful high school education. This effort is evidenced by the continuous increase in student performance, including ECA data, credits earned, graduation numbers, and those employed after graduation.

Overall, the school and network leadership were consistently effective in their organizational and academic oversight and receive a **Meets Standard** for this indicator.

3.2. Does the school satisfactorily comply with all its organizational structure and governance obligations?							
<b>Indicator Targets</b>	Does not meet standard		The school presents concerns in a majority of the sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.				
	Approaching standard		The school presents concerns in a minimal number of the sub-indicators and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.				
	Meets standard		The school complies with and presents no concerns in the sub-indicators below.				
	Exceeds standard		The school consistently and effectively complies with and presents no concerns in the sub-indicators below.				
<b>3.2 Rating</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 6</b>	<b>Year 7</b>
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	<b>2015-16</b>	2016-17
	MS	MS	MS	MS	AS	ES	
<b>Sub-indicator Ratings</b>	Sub-indicators						Rating
	Submission of all required compliance documentation in a timely manner as set forth by the Mayor's Office, including but not limited to: meeting minutes and schedules, board member information, compliance reports and employee documentation						ES
	Compliance with the terms of its charter, including amendments, school policies and regulations, and applicable federal and state laws						MS
	Proactive and productive collaboration with its board and/or management organization (if applicable) in meeting governance obligations						ES
	Active participation in scheduled meetings with OEI, including the submission of required documentation by deadlines						MS

During the 2015-16 school year, one of the Regional Directors was responsible for submitting compliance documents to the Mayor's Office (OEI). 100% of documents were submitted on time and all governance obligations were met.

The Excel Center maintained compliance with all material sections of its charter and submitted amendments as necessary. The Regional Director and School Directors were consistently actively engaged in meetings with OEI and maintained frequent communication with OEI between scheduled meetings. Thus, The Excel Center receives an **Exceeds Standard** for compliance obligations.

**On-Time Compliance Reporting Percentage (3.2a)**


<b>3.3. Is the school's board active, knowledgeable, and does it abide by appropriate policies, systems, and processes in its oversight?</b>							
<b>Indicator Targets</b>	Does not meet standard		The school presents concerns in a majority of the sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.				
	Approaching standard		The school presents concerns in a minimal number of the sub-indicators and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.				
	Meets standard		The school complies with and presents no concerns in the sub-indicators below.				
	Exceeds standard		The school consistently and effectively complies with and presents no concerns in the sub-indicators below.				
<b>3.3 Rating</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 6</b>	<b>Year 7</b>
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	<b>2015-16</b>	2016-17
	ES	ES	MS	MS	MS	AS	
<b>Sub-indicator Ratings</b>	Sub-indicators`						Rating
	Timely communication of organizational, leadership, academic, fiscal, or facility deficiencies to the Mayor's Office; or when the school's management company (if applicable) fails to meet its obligations as set forth in the charter						MS
	Clear understanding of the mission and vision of the school						ES
	Adherence to board policies and procedures, including those established in the by-laws, and revision of policies and procedures, as necessary						DNMS
	Recruitment and selection of members that are knowledgeable, represent diverse skill sets, and act in the best interest of the school and establishment of systems for member orientation and training						MS
	Effective and transparent management of conflicts of interest						MS
	Collaboration with school leadership that is fair, timely, consistent, and transparent in handling complaints or concerns						MS
	Adherence to its charter agreement as it pertains to governance structure						MS
	Holding of all meetings in accordance with Indiana Open Door Law						MS

The Goodwill Education Initiatives board, which governs the network of Excel Centers, Indianapolis Metropolitan High School, and the newly-approved Westside Middle School, is experienced and is comprised of members who bring a wide range of skillsets including finance, government, education, business, public health, legal, and real estate. In an effort to ensure alignment, two representatives from Goodwill Initiatives of Central Indiana (GICI) reside on the board as non-voting, ex-officio members.

The board maintained compliance with the vast majority of its bylaws, policies, and procedures during the 2015-16 school year. Currently, the board's bylaws indicate that it must have 9 directors. In June 2015, the board voted for a variance in the membership bylaws to allow for 8 members with the caveat that the board would be back to 9 members by the annual meeting on December 7, 2015. While the board actively recruited during the 2015-16 school year, two positions are still left to be filled. On the official board roster shared as of July 2016, the board had only 7 active directors. Although the bylaws indicate that the board may take a vote to decrease the size of the board, bylaws submitted for the 2016-17 school year indicate that no such change had been made and now additional variance was voted on to address the 7 member roster.

#### Skill Sets Represented on Board

**Education**



**Business/  
Marketing**



**Finance**



**Real  
Estate**



**Public  
Health**



**Legal**



#### Board Overview

**Goodwill Education Initiatives, Inc. holds the charter  
for the Excel Center.**

**9**

**Members**

**majority**

**# Required for Quorum**

**The Excel board meets bi-monthly.**

**Goodwill Education Initiatives, Inc. operates 11 Excel  
Centers across Indiana as well as Indianapolis  
Metropolitan High School.**

The Regional Directors and the Chief Operating Officer (COO) of GEI handled the majority of communication between the board and the Mayor's Office and were both proactive in communicating updates and concerns with both parties. Meetings were held as scheduled, met quorum with the majority of directors in attendance at each meeting, and abided by Indiana Open Door Law. No conflicts of interest were noted during the 2015-2016 school year.

Thus, for the 2015-2016 school year, the board receives an **Approaching Standard** for this indicator.

**3.4. Does the school's board work to foster a school environment that is viable and effective?**

<b>Indicator Targets</b>	Does not meet standard	The school presents concerns in a majority of the sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.					
	Approaching standard	The school presents concerns in a minimal number of the sub-indicators and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.					
	Meets standard	The school complies with and presents no concerns in the sub-indicators below.					
	Exceeds standard	The school consistently and effectively complies with and presents no concerns in the sub-indicators below.					
<b>3.4 Rating</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 6</b>	<b>Year 7</b>
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	<b>2015-16</b>	2016-17
	n/a	n/a	n/a	MS	MS	MS	
<b>Sub-indicator Ratings</b>	Sub-indicators						Rating
	Regular communication with school leadership and/or its management company						MS
	Annual utilization of a performance based evaluation to assess its own performance, that of the school leader, and management organization (if applicable)						AS
	Collaboration with the school leader to establish clear objectives, priorities, and goals						MS
	Interaction with school leader that is conducive to the success of the school, including requesting and disseminating information in a timely manner, providing continuous and constructive feedback, and engaging the school leader in school improvement plans						MS

The Goodwill Education Initiatives board held semi-monthly meetings in which many stakeholders, including representatives from GEI, Regional Directors, and other relevant staff members, provided thorough reports on school performance. Between meetings, the Regional Directors communicated with the COO for GEI and the board chair when necessary to provide leadership and support in school initiatives and events.

The GEI and Excel Center staffs created and managed rigorous priorities and goals for the school. At each board meeting, they provided data to demonstrate the school's progress towards achieving the goals and received feedback from the board. While the board was actively engaged in discussing how to best support the school throughout the year, it did not employ a formal method of setting goals for itself or assessing its own performance. This made it difficult to objectively gauge the board's own effectiveness at the end of the year.

In all observed meetings and interactions, the board, network, and school leadership teams appeared to have a positive and productive working relationship. The Regional Directors and COO were self-reflective and proactive, allowing for relevant and transparent meetings that demonstrated a constant commitment to school improvement. For all of the reasons described above, the Excel Center receives a Meets Standard for school and board environment.

3.5. Does the school comply with applicable laws, regulations, and provisions of the charter agreement relating to the safety and security of the facility?							
<b>Indicator Targets</b>	Does not meet standard		The school presents concerns in a majority of the sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.				
	Approaching standard		The school presents concerns in a minimal number of the sub-indicators and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.				
	Meets standard		The school complies with and presents no concerns in the sub-indicators below.				
	Exceeds standard		The school consistently and effectively complies with and presents no concerns in the sub-indicators below.				
<b>3.5 Rating</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 6</b>	<b>Year 7</b>
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	<b>2015-16</b>	2016-17
	MS	MS	MS	MS	MS	MS	
<b>Sub-indicator Ratings</b>	Sub-indicators						Rating
	Health and safety code requirements						MS
	Facility accessibility						MS
	Updated safety and emergency management plans						MS
	A facility that is well suited to meet the curricular and social needs of the students, faculty, and members of the community						MS

In 2015-16, the Excel Center's facilities met all health and safety code requirements and provided a safe environment conducive to learning. The design, size, maintenance, security, equipment and furniture of the facilities were all adequate to meet the schools' needs. The schools were accessible to all, including people with physical disabilities. The Mayor's Office monitoring of the Excel Center's compliance with health and safety code requirements did not reveal any significant concerns related to these obligations. Accordingly, it receives a Meets Standard for this indicator for 2015-16.

3.6. Is the school meeting its school-specific non-academic goals?							
<b>Indicator Targets</b>	Does not meet standard		The school does not meet standard on either school-specific non-academic goal.				
	Approaching standard		School is 1) approaching standard on one school-specific non-academic goal, while not meeting standard on the second goal, 2) approaching standard on both school-specific non-academic goals, OR 3) meeting standard on one school-specific non-academic goal, while approaching standard on the second goal.				
	Meets standard		School is 1) meeting standard on both school-specific non-academic goals, OR 2) meeting standard on one school-specific non-academic goal while exceeding standard on the second goal.				
	Exceeds standard		School is exceeding standard on both school-specific non-academic goals.				
<b>3.6 Rating</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 6</b>	<b>Year 7</b>
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	<b>2015-16</b>	2016-17
	NA	NA	NA	NA	MS	ES	
<b>School-Specific Goals</b>	Sub-indicators						Rating
	Graduates of the Excel Center will earn greater than \$10.50 per hour if on a career track.						ES
	Excel Center will retain 90% of staff rated "effective" during the 2015-2016 school year.						ES

Each year, Mayor-sponsored charter schools set two non-academic goals that are aligned to or support the school's unique mission. All data for school-specific goals is self-reported by the individual school.

In the 2015-16 school year, the Excel Center set its first goal around graduate wages. The school reported that the average earnings for graduates on a career track were \$10.64, earning the school a rating of **Exceeds Standard** on its first goal.

The Excel Center set its second goal around teacher retention. During the 2015-16 school year, the Excel Center reported that 92.5% of its staff was retained within the network, and thus receives an **Exceeds Standard** on its second goal.

Overall, due to the ratings of the individual goals above, the Excel Center receives an **Exceeds Standard** on this indicator for the 2015-16 school year.